

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-34 were pending at the time of the Office Action and remain currently pending, with claims 1, 10, 17, 25, 26, 31, 34, 35, 40 and 42 being independent. Claims 35-42 were previously withdrawn, without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1-4, 10-13, 17, 21-22, 25-29, 31-34 are amended herein. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure at least at paragraphs [0006]-[0007] and Fig. 2. No new matter has been added.

### **§ 112 SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS**

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as allegedly being indefinite. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has changed the claim to read: “wherein [[the]] a profile register comprises at least one a plurality of extensible profile data structures, and wherein each extensible profile data structure comprises a key that identifies a task.”

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection.

### **§ 102 REJECTIONS**

Claims 1, 10, 17, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al).

Claims 17, 18, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,470,378 (Tracton et al).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, the independent claims have been amended as proposed during the interview and are believed to be allowable.

**In view of Sahai et al**

Claims 1, 10, 17, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Independent claim 1**, as presently presented, recites:

1. (Currently Amended) A method of selecting at least one digital media component to construct a device that accomplishes one or more tasks identified in **an extensible** profile, comprising:

retrieving, from the **extensible** profile, at least one required capability for performing the selected task **as requested by an application**;

selecting, from a component register, one or more component entries with capability lists that include the required capability; and

instantiating one or more components corresponding to the selected entries, **wherein instantiating occurs via an Application Programming Interface (API)**,

**wherein the application uses the extensible profile to determine which of the one or more components are needed for the selected task, and**

**wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application.**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sahai. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 1 as discussed during the above-referenced interview. Applicant respectfully asserts that the evidence in the Sahai reference does not disclose the subject matter of amended claim 1. Specifically, Applicant asserts that the evidence in the Sahai reference does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, “**the application uses the extensible profile to determine which of the one or more components are needed for the selected task, wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application.**” (emphasis added).

Instead, Sahai is directed to: “system in which packet-switched (or general purpose network) multimedia data streaming is controlled based on the capabilities of a client and the preferences of a user...”, as discussed during the interview (Abstract). Thus, Sahai does not disclose the subject matter of this claim, specifically “**the application uses the extensible profile to determine which of the one or more components are needed for the selected task, wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application.**”

During the above-referenced interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication and, for at least this reason, submits that this claim stands allowable.

**Independent claim 10**, as presently presented, recites:

10. (Currently Amended) An apparatus, comprising:  
a processor;  
a memory module connected to the processor and comprising logic instructions operative to configure the processor to:  
retrieve, from **an extensible profile**, at least one required capability for  
performing a selected task **as requested by an application**;  
select, from a component register, one or more entries that include the required capability in their capability list; and  
instantiate **via an application programming interface (API)** one or more components corresponding to the selected entries;  
**wherein the application uses the extensible profile to determine which of the one or more components are needed for the selected task, wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application.**

In making out a rejection of this claim before its amendment, the Office states that Sahai anticipates. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 10 as discussed during the above-referenced interview. Applicant asserts that the evidence in the Sahai reference fails to anticipate amended independent claim 10 because the evidence in the Sahai reference does not disclose, expressly or inherently, the recited features of the claimed subject matter at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regards to claim 1.

During the above-referenced interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication and, for at least this reason, submits that this claim stands allowable.

**Independent claim 17**, as presently presented, recites:

17. (Currently Amended) A method of interfacing digital media components on a computer-based processing device, comprising:  
constructing a component register comprising of entries which contain listings of capabilities of digital media components accessible to the computer-based processing device; and  
in response to a request from an application for digital media services, searching the component register for a component capable of providing the requested service,  
**wherein the application uses an extensible profile to determine which of the digital media components are needed for the selected task,**  
**wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application.**

In making out a rejection of this claim before its amendment, the Office states that Sahai anticipates. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 17 as discussed during the above-referenced interview. Applicant asserts that the evidence in the Sahai reference fails to anticipate amended independent claim 17 because the evidence in the Sahai reference does not disclose, expressly or inherently, the recited features of the claimed subject matter at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regards to claim 1.

During the above-referenced interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication and, for at least this reason, submits that this claim stands allowable.

**Independent claim 31**, as presently presented, recites:

31. (Currently Amended) A method of assembling and configuring a topology of digital media components on a computer-based processing device, comprising:

using a profile structure and one or more associated capability lists to select a component;

instantiating the selected component;

applying **an extensible** profile to the selected component; and

logically connecting the component to one or more additional components,

**wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying a requesting application.**

In making out a rejection of this claim before its amendment, the Office states that Sahai anticipates. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 31 as discussed during the above-referenced interview. Applicant asserts that the evidence in the Sahai reference fails to anticipate amended independent claim 31 because the evidence in the Sahai reference does not disclose, expressly or inherently, the recited features of the claimed subject matter at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regards to claim 1.

During the above-referenced interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication and, for at least this reason, submits that this claim stands allowable.

**In view of Tracton et al**

Claims 17, 18, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,470,378 (Tracton et al). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Independent claim 17**, as presently presented, recites:

17. (Currently Amended) A method of interfacing digital media components on a computer-based processing device, comprising:  
constructing a component register comprising of entries which contain listings of capabilities of digital media components accessible to the computer-based processing device; and  
in response to a request from an application for digital media services, searching the component register for a component capable of providing the requested service,  
**wherein the application uses an extensible profile to determine which of the digital media components are needed for the selected task,**  
**wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application.**

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tracton. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 17 as discussed during the above-referenced interview. Applicant respectfully asserts that the evidence in the Tracton reference does not disclose the subject matter of amended claim 17. Specifically, Applicant asserts that the evidence in the Tracton reference does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, "**the application uses an extensible profile to determine which of the digital media components are needed for the selected task, wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application.**" (emphasis added).

Instead, Tracton is directed to: “The invention provides for servicing a client. A request is received from a client having certain capabilities. This request is automatically satisfied in a manner tailored to the capabilities of the client,” as discussed during the interview. (Abstract). Thus, Tracton does not disclose the subject matter of this claim, specifically **“the application uses an extensible profile to determine which of the digital media components are needed for the selected task, wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application.”**

During the above-referenced interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication and, for at least this reason, submits that this claim stands allowable.

**Dependent claim 18** depends from independent claim 17 and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests the §102 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**Independent claim 25**, as presently presented, recites:

25. (Currently Amended) A method of interfacing digital media components on a computer-based processing device, comprising:

constructing a component register comprising at least one entry including listings of capabilities of digital media components accessible to the computer-based processing device, wherein at least one listing comprises one or more data fields, including:

    a first data field that identifies a function performed by a digital media component; and

    a second data field that identifies one or more operational parameters associated with a function identified in the first data field ;

constructing a profile register comprising at least one record representing a digital media function, the record comprising a data field having one

or more operating parameters associated with the digital media function; and

in response to a request from an application for digital media services:

searching the profile register for a record that corresponds to the requested media service; and

searching the component register for a component capable of providing the requested service,

**wherein the profile register is used to determine which of the digital media components are needed for the request from the application for digital media services,**

**wherein the profile register may be updated or modified without modifying the application for digital media services.**

In making out a rejection of this claim before its amendment, the Office states that Tracton anticipates. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 25 as discussed during the above-referenced interview. Applicant asserts that the evidence in the Tracton reference fails to anticipate amended independent claim 25 because the evidence in the Tracton reference does not disclose, expressly or inherently, the recited features of the claimed subject matter at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regards to claim 17.

During the above-referenced interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication and, for at least this reason, submits that this claim stands allowable.

### **§ 103 REJECTIONS**

Claims 1-16, 19-24, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,470,378 (Tracton et al) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al).

Claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,470,378 (Tracton et al) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al) and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0097458 (Bourges-Sevenier).

Claims 26, 27, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0097458 (Bourges-Sevenier) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al).

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0097458 (Bourges-Sevenier) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,625 (Tso et al).

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0204073 (Yanosy).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, the independent claims have been amended as proposed during the interview and are believed to be allowable.

### **Tracton et al in view of Sahai et al**

Claims 1-16, 19-24, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,470,378 (Tracton et al) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Independent claim 1**, as presently presented, recites:

1. (Currently Amended) A method of selecting at least one digital media component to construct a device that accomplishes one or more tasks identified in **an extensible profile**, comprising:
  - retrieving, from the **extensible profile**, at least one required capability for performing the selected task **as requested by an application**;
  - selecting, from a component register, one or more component entries with capability lists that include the required capability; and
  - instantiating one or more components corresponding to the selected entries, **wherein instantiating occurs via an Application Programming Interface (API)**,
  - wherein the application uses the extensible profile to determine which of the one or more components are needed for the selected task, and**
  - wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application.**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over (Sahai) in view of (Tracton). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, independent claim 1 is amended to more distinctly recite features of Applicant's claimed subject matter.

Sahai is directed to: "system in which packet-switched (or general purpose network) multimedia data streaming is controlled based on the capabilities of a client and the preferences of a user." (Abstract). However, Sahai fails to disclose Applicant's claimed operation of "**the application uses the extensible profile to determine which**

**“of the one or more components are needed for the selected task, wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application”,** as discussed during the interview. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the evidence in the Sahai reference does not teach or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 1.

Applicant also respectfully submits that the Tracton reference does not teach or suggest the features of amended claim 1. Tracton allegedly describes: “The invention provides for servicing a client. A request is received from a client having certain capabilities. This request is automatically satisfied in a manner tailored to the capabilities of the client.” (Abstract).

However, Tracton fails to remedy the deficiencies in Sahai noted above. For example, Tracton fails to teach or suggest, **“the application uses the extensible profile to determine which of the one or more components are needed for the selected task, wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application,”** as presently recited. (emphasis added).

Thus, Sahai and Tracton, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to teach or suggest the features of this claim. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, this claim is allowable.

**Dependent claims 2-9** depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**Independent claim 10**, as presently presented, recites:

10. (Currently Amended) An apparatus, comprising:  
a processor;  
a memory module connected to the processor and comprising logic instructions operative to configure the processor to:  
retrieve, from **an extensible profile**, at least one required capability for  
performing a selected task **as requested by an application**;  
select, from a component register, one or more entries that include the required capability in their capability list; and  
instantiate **via an application programming interface (API)** one or more components corresponding to the selected entries;  
**wherein the application uses the extensible profile to determine which of the one or more components are needed for the selected task, wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying the application.**

In making out a rejection of this claim 10 before its amendment, the Office states that this claim is obvious over Wilkins in view of Sahai. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 10 as discussed during the above-referenced interview. Applicant asserts that the evidence in the Tracton reference fails to teach or suggest the features of amended independent claim 10, at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regards to claim 1. Additionally, Applicant also asserts that Sahai fails to remedy the deficiencies in Tracton noted above, at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regards to claim 1.

During the above-referenced interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication and, for at least this reason, submits that this claim stands allowable.

**Dependent claims 11-16** depend from independent claim 10 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 19-24** depend from independent claim 17 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Specifically, Tracton in view of Sahai, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to teach or suggest the features of dependent claims 19-24. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, claims 19-24 are allowable and Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

**Independent claim 31**, as presently presented, recites:

31. (Currently Amended) A method of assembling and configuring a topology of digital media components on a computer-based processing device, comprising:

using a profile structure and one or more associated capability lists to select a component;

instantiating the selected component;

applying **an extensible** profile to the selected component; and

logically connecting the component to one or more additional components,

**wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying a requesting application.**

In making out a rejection of this claim 31 before its amendment, the Office states that this claim is obvious over Wilkins in view of Sahai. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 31 as

discussed during the above-referenced interview. Applicant asserts that the evidence in the Tracton reference fails to teach or suggest the features of amended independent claim 31, at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regards to claim 1. Additionally, Applicant also asserts that Sahai fails to remedy the deficiencies in Tracton noted above, at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regards to claim 1.

During the above-referenced interview, Applicant understood the Office to agree. Applicant sincerely thanks the Office for this indication and, for at least this reason, submits that this claim stands allowable.

**Tracton et al in view of Sahai et al and further in view of Bourges-Sevenier**

Claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,470,378 (Tracton et al) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al) and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0097458 (Bourges-Sevenier). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent claims 32-33** depend from independent claim 31 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**Bourges-Sevenier in view of Sahai et al**

Claims 26, 27, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0097458 (Bourges-Sevenier) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Independent claim 26**, as presently presented, recites:

26. (Currently Amended) A method of assembling a topology of digital media components on a computer-based processing device, comprising:

- reading lists of capabilities from a profile register;
- searching a component register for entries containing the capabilities indicated in the profile register; and
- rejecting components that lack the capabilities indicated in the profile register, or that have capabilities incompatible with the capabilities in the profile register,

**wherein the profile register determines which components are needed for a selected task requested by an application,**

**wherein the profile register may be updated or modified without modifying the application.**

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over (Bourges-Sevenier) in view of (Sahai). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, independent claim 26 is amended to more distinctly recite features of Applicant's claimed subject matter.

Bourges-Sevenier is directed to: "Four new nodes are proposed for an MPEG 4 audiovisual streaming data. Each of the nodes is encoded as a declarative operation in the scene data field of the MPEG 4 standard. The nodes are physics node, non-linear deformer node, MP4 movie texture node and camera sensor node." (Abstract). However, Bourges-Sevenier fails to disclose Applicant's claimed operation of "**wherein the profile register determines which components are needed for a selected task requested by an application, wherein the profile register maybe updated or modified without modifying the application**", as discussed during the interview. Therefore,

Applicant respectfully asserts that the evidence in the Bourges-Sevenier reference does not teach or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 26.

Applicant also respectfully submits that the Sahai reference does not teach or suggest the features of amended claim 26. Sahai allegedly describes: “system in which packet-switched (or general purpose network) multimedia data streaming is controlled based on the capabilities of a client and the preferences of a user.” (Abstract).

However, Sahai fails to remedy the deficiencies in Bourges-Sevenier noted above. For example, Sahai fails to teach or suggest, “**wherein the profile register determines which components are needed for a selected task requested by an application, wherein the profile register maybe updated or modified without modifying the application,**” as presently recited. (emphasis added).

Thus, Bourges-Sevenier and Sahai, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to teach or suggest the features of this claim. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, this claim is allowable.

**Dependent claims 27, 29, and 30** depend from independent claim 26 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

#### **Bourges-Sevenier in view of Sahai et al and further in view of Tso et al**

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0097458 (Bourges-Sevenier) in view of U.S. Patent

No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,625 (Tso et al).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent claim 28** depends from independent claim 26 and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

As discussed above, Bourges-Sevenier in view of Sahai, fails to teach or suggest the features of independent claims 19-24.

Tso was cited for its alleged teaching of, “A system for enhancing data access over a communications link is disclosed. In accordance with a particular embodiment, a system for retrieving an object over a computer network includes a network client with a browser for rendering an object to a user and a user interface enabling the user to establish an encoding preference. A remote scaling server is coupled between the network client and the computer network, and includes a remote proxy and an encode service provider..” However, even if for the sake or argument that Tso discloses such features, Tso still fails to remedy the deficiencies in Bourges-Sevenier and Sahai noted above. For instance, Tso fails to teach or suggest, **“wherein the profile register determines which components are needed for a selected task requested by an application, wherein the profile register maybe updated or modified without modifying the application.” (emphasis added).**

Thus, Bourges-Sevenier in view of Sahai in further view of Tso, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to teach or suggest the features of dependent claim 28. Accordingly, as discussed

during the interview, claim 28 are allowable and Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

**Sahai et al in view of Yanosy**

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699 (Sahai et al) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0204073 (Yanosy). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Independent claim 34**, as presently presented, recites:

34. (Currently Amended) A method of configuring a topology of encoding and multiplexing digital media components on a computer-based processing device, comprising:  
searching **an extensible** profile for a multiplexer subprofile configuration;  
searching a component register for a multiplexer object compatible with the multiplexer subprofile;  
instantiating a multiplexer;  
configuring the multiplexer by applying the subprofile configuration settings using an interface API;  
connecting the multiplexer to an output of a content source, and, for each input stream of the multiplexer:  
searching the **extensible** profile for an encoder subprofile;  
searching the component register for a multiplexer object compatible with the subprofile;  
configuring the encoder by applying the subprofile configuration settings using an interface API; and  
connecting the encoder to the multiplexer,  
**wherein the extensible profile determines which multiplexer objects are compatible with the multiplexer subprofile information,**  
**wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying a requesting application.**

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over (Sahai) in view of (Yanosy). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, independent claim 34 is amended to more distinctly recite features of Applicant's claimed subject matter.

Sahai is directed to: "system in which packet-switched (or general purpose network) multimedia data streaming is controlled based on the capabilities of a client and the preferences of a user." (Abstract). However, Sahai fails to disclose Applicant's claimed operation of "**wherein the extensible profile determines which multiplexer objects are compatible with the multiplexer subprofile information, wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying a requesting application**", as discussed during the interview. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the evidence in the Sahai reference does not teach or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 34.

Applicant also respectfully submits that the Yanosy reference does not teach or suggest the features of amended claim 34. Yanosy allegedly describes: "In operation, the mobile device application (103) requests device augmentation. The request is forwarded from the virtual operating system (104) to the broker (123). The broker (123) determines an appropriate sharable resource by comparing the device profile (101) with a directory of sharable resources stored in a knowledge base (126). The mediator (124) coordinates the specific access to the sharable resource with the device application (103). The device application (103) can specify sharable resources by providing an application program interface." (Abstract).

However, Yanosy fails to remedy the deficiencies in Sahai noted above. For example, Yanosy fails to teach or suggest, “**wherein the extensible profile determines which multiplexer objects are compatible with the multiplexer subprofile information, wherein the extensible profile may be updated or modified without modifying a requesting application,**” as presently recited. (emphasis added).

Thus, Yanosy and Sahai, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to teach or suggest the features of this claim. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, this claim is allowable.

## **CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

By: /David K. Sakata/ Dated: 5/26/2008

David K. Sakata ([davids@leehayes.com](mailto:davids@leehayes.com); x216)  
Registration No. 59,959

Robert G. Hartman ([rob@leehayes.com](mailto:rob@leehayes.com); x265)  
Registration No. 58,970  
Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256  
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979